

## Meeting Minutes

### Attendance

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DeDe Edwards, Foster Farms             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Dick Mettler, NW Wall & Ceiling Contractors |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clif Finch, Association of WA Business | <input type="checkbox"/> Gary Smith, Indep Business Assoc of WA                 |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steve George, Hop Growers of WA        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rob Sumner, Timber Operator's Council       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> John Jagelski, Vanalco Inc             |   |

### **Committee Pre-Meeting:**

The Retro Advisory Committee held a pre-meeting to go over Retro Rules Draft 3 on June 9th. Frank Romero presented an overview of Draft 3. After some discussion the committee agreed to endorse the ideas contained in Draft 3.

### **Regular Meeting of the Committee:**

Frank called the meeting to order around 1:00 P.M. He introduced himself as the acting manager of the retrospective rating program and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Frank introduced John Jagelski, the newest member of the Retro Advisory Committee, to those present at the meeting. John gave a little background about Vanalco, the company he works for, and how safety has played a large part of turning the company's loss experience around. John described his eagerness to participate in this committee and how he felt his experience would be of benefit to this group. We welcomed John as a member of our Retro team.

Next, Frank asked if there were corrections to minutes of the last meeting. Hearing none, Tom Kwieciak offered a motion to accept the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Dick Mettler and the committee voted to accept the minutes as published.

The next order of business was an overview of the agenda for today's meeting and to bring everyone up to date with the results of a special meeting of the retro advisory committee subcommittee's work on the proposed retro rules, which was identified as Draft 3. With this, Frank gave the committee an overview of where we were with the process. Committee members fielded several questions regarding Draft 3 from members of the audience. Major concerns appeared to be the pace under which the department and the Committee were moving to get new rules in place. Some members of the audience wanted the process slowed down. Frank asked the audience what was to be gained by slowing the process down? The concern was that the public would not have ample time to review Draft 3 and comment on it.

Frank indicated that he was going to hold four meetings around the state in July to solicit input on the ideas expressed in Draft 3. With this assurance the members of the audience were in agreement that we should move forward with the process since the public would have time to review the draft and comment on it before it went to formal rule making. With that a motion was made that the committee approve Draft 3. The motion was seconded and approved.

A request was made that the department produce meeting minutes more timely so that everyone has a chance to review them before the next meeting.

With that, the meeting was adjourned around 2:30 PM.